

**From:** [Seppi, Pat](#)  
**To:** [Thomas Conway](#)  
**Cc:** [Gowers, Joe](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Ringwood Mines/Landfill Superfund Site Comments (OU3)  
**Date:** Monday, May 04, 2020 7:27:16 PM

---

You are on my email list as [REDACTED] – the same as above. I don't know why you're not receiving my emails. I took a screen shot and will send it to you to show you that your name is on the email list. Is it possible the emails are going to trash or someplace else? Please let me know if you get this.

thanks  
Pat

**From:** Thomas Conway [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 04, 2020 5:18 PM  
**To:** Seppi, Pat <[Seppi.Pat@epa.gov](mailto:Seppi.Pat@epa.gov)>; Gowers, Joe <[Gowers.Joe@epa.gov](mailto:Gowers.Joe@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Lopez, Peter <[lopez.peter@epa.gov](mailto:lopez.peter@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Ringwood Mines/Landfill Superfund Site Comments (OU3)

Ms. Seppi:

Have I been removed from that list again? It would be the second time I dropped off without explanation.

The site has not been updated:

<https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/cursites/csinfo.cfm?id=0200663>

As you can imagine, this poor communication is beyond occasional misfires. I get dropped off lists, find dead links from a month ago, and the main page I use to keep up with info is not even updated. Facebook and Twitter don't have this update either.

Regards,  
Thomas Conway  
Chair, Ringwood Environmental Commission  
[REDACTED]

On Mon, May 4, 2020 at 5:08 PM Seppi, Pat <[Seppi.Pat@epa.gov](mailto:Seppi.Pat@epa.gov)> wrote:

Mr. Conway,

I will let Joe Gowers address your email, but I wanted to make sure you're aware that EPA did extend the comment period for the third time. The closing of the comment period is now June 3,

2020. A news release went out today and I did send a copy of the release to my Ringwood email list.

Thank you for your continued interest in the Ringwood Mines site.

Pat

Sent from my iPhone

On May 4, 2020, at 5:00 PM, Seppi, Pat <[Seppi.Pat@epa.gov](mailto:Seppi.Pat@epa.gov)> wrote:

Sent from my iPhone

On May 4, 2020, at 4:46 PM, Thomas Conway

 wrote:

Comments on the Proposed Cleanup Plan to Address Groundwater Contamination at the Ringwood Mines/Landfill Superfund Site

Mr. Gowers:

First, I am shocked that the comment period was not extended again. I realize that another extension would be very unusual, but these are unusual times. Please forgive any errors and the lack of sources cited.

Ringwood is surrounded by parks and as the Environmental Chair; I have had to spend considerable time dealing with the ATV invasion brought on by park closures. I fight every day to keep my business running while also trying to responsibly provide for my family. Needless to say, I have not been able to find the time to prepare proper comments for the terrible plan the EPA has proposed for the Groundwater. It is unconscionable for the EPA to keep this timeline in light of the worldwide catastrophe that is tying up many resources. Unfortunately, it does continue a pattern of the EPA trying to mute the public and close this Superfund site. Even the meeting in February was given very short public notice.

Your April 1 letter says: "To view the EPA's proposed plan for the groundwater and mine water at the site, please visit [www.epa.gov/superfund/ringwood-mines](http://www.epa.gov/superfund/ringwood-mines)". This link goes to a page that does not exist. The incompetence by the EPA is so profound that it seems intentionally misleading.

I believe this plan has major shortcomings. Without the time to fully expound on them all, I am forced to jot down this quick summary.

1. The EPA methodology does not seem to account for people living above this entire area. I would like to see more research on vapors from the contamination.
2. Phytoremediation seems ideal for groundwater remediation. Why is this not being tested or even proposed? This is the perfect site for phytoremediation.
3. The monitoring wells may not work. The EPA says it cannot determine the source of the contamination, yet it will setup monitoring wells. Seems like double speak. The source is Peter's Mine and it should be pumped and treated.
4. We have no idea what is below the airshaft in the mines. The alternatives discussed for cleaning the airshaft are equivalent to cleaning a cove in a lake. Your reports indicate 50 gallons of water an hour move up and out of the airshaft. Clearly there are millions of gallons of tainted water below this grade and you are only modeling for the amount in the airshaft.
5. No one knows the water pathways there. That's a fact. Yet you write that the monitoring wells will be sufficient. This is a shot in the dark or worse, just scraping the surface.
6. Is there any concern that bedrock aquifer wells will create new pathways for the water to reach the surface?
7. The report correctly acknowledges that oxygenation will help naturally attenuate some of the contaminants. Is there a risk that some of this may escape in gaseous form and hurt the residents?
8. The water patterns are unknown. Five years between monitoring events seems too long.

Please extend the comment period. We need more time to fully review this proposal. This is a decades-long Superfund site and it seems rushed to force this solution through during the Covid19 crisis. This would be a new low for the EPA at this site and the EPA has already shot through the floor a few times.

Regards,

Thomas Conway  
Chair, Ringwood Environmental Commission